arXiv:1212.0003v1 [physics.gen-ph] 30 Nov 2012

# Does recent observations favour cosmological event horizon: A thermodynamical prescription?

Subhajit Saha[1]
Subenoy Chakraborty[2]

*Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata-700032, India.*

## Abstract

Recent observational evidences claim an accelerating expansion of the universe at present epoch. It is commonly incorporated in standard cosmology by introduction of an exotic matter(that violates the strong energy condition) known as dark energy(DE). As event horizon exists for accelerating universe so there are lot of works for universal thermodynamics(i.e., thermodynamics of the universe bounded by apparent or event horizon). Recently, thermodynamical equilibrium has been examined for both the horizons. In the present letter we show that universal thermodynamics with event horizon is favoured by DE from the point of view of thermodynamical prescription.

Keywords: Accelerating universe, cosmological event horizon, modified Hawking temperature.

Pacs numbers : 98.80.Cq, 98.80.-k

## INTRODUCTION

Almost at the fog end of the last century there was a great blow to the standard cosmology due to the observational prediction [1-3] that the universe is passing through an accelerating phase. As a result the standard cosmology is tuned either physically by incorporating dominant matter component having large negative pressure(known as dark energy(DE)) or geometrically, by introducing modified gravity theories.

Since recent past a lot of works have been going on universal thermodynamics mostly with apparent horizon as the boundary. The pioneer work of Wang et al [4] has made a comparative study of the two horizons(apparent and event) by examining the validity of the thermodynamical laws for DE fluids. Based on their results, they have concluded that universe bounded by the apparent horizon is a Bekenstein system while cosmological event horizon is unphysical from thermodynamical point of view. However, due to the relevance of the cosmological event horizon in the present DE dominated universe, we have shown [5] the validity of the generalized second law of thermodynamics(GSLT) on the event horizon(in any gravity theory) assuming the validity of the first law with some reasonable restrictions. Subsequently, it is possible to show [6] the validity of the first law of thermodynamics on the event horizon for some simple DE fluids with a modified Hawking temperature on the event horizon. Also very recently, thermodynamical equilibrium has been studied [7,8] for universe bounded by any of the two horizons and for various DE models. Motivated by one of the latest work of Pavon and collaborator [9] on the thermodynamic motivation for DE, in the present work, we make an attempt to show that universe bounded by event horizon is favoured by DE fluid from thermodynamical point of view i.e., validity of GSLT as well as thermodynamical equilibrium.

---

[1] subhajit1729@gmail.com
[2] schakraborty@math.jdvu.ac.in

According to thermodynamics, the equilibrium configuration of an isolated macroscopic physical system should be the maximum entropy state(consistent with the constraints imposed on the system). Thus if S be the entropy of the system then we must have [7,10]

i) $\dot{S} \geq 0$ (i.e., the entropy function cannot decrease, the second law of thermodynamics)
ii)$\ddot{S} < 0$ (i.e., the entropy function attains a maximum)

In the present context, the universe filled with DE fluid and bounded by the horizon is considered as an isolated macroscopic system for which the above inequalities are generalized as [7]

$$i)\ \dot{S}_h + \dot{S}_{fh} \geq 0 \quad , \quad ii)\ \ddot{S}_h + \ddot{S}_{fh} < 0 \tag{1}$$

Here $S_h$ and $S_{fh}$ are the entropies of the horizon and that of the fluid within it respectively. Now in order to determine the entropy variations we shall use the simplest form of the first law of thermodynamics(i.e., Clausius relation)

$$T_h dS_h = \delta Q_h = -dE_h \tag{2}$$

and the Gibb's relation [11]

$$T_f dS_{fh} = dE_h + p dV_h \tag{3}$$

where $E_h$ is the energy flow across the horizon, $E_h = \rho V_h$ is the total energy of the fluid inside, $V_h = \frac{4}{3}\pi {R_h}^3$ is the volume of the fluid and $(T_h,\, T_f)$ are the temperature of the horizon and that of the fluid respectively.

Here due to the Wilkinson Microwave Anistropy Probe data [12], we choose flat homogeneous and isotropic FRW model of the universe for which the two horizons are related by the relation

$$R_A = \frac{1}{H} = R_H < R_E, \tag{4}$$

where $R_A$ and $R_E$ are the radius of the apparent horizon and that of the event horizon respectively($R_H$ is the Hubble horizon). As universe bounded by the apparent horizon is a Bekenstein system so we use Bekenstein's entropy-area relation and Hawking temperature as

$$S_A = \frac{\pi {R_A}^2}{G} \quad , \quad T_A = \frac{1}{2\pi R_A}. \tag{5}$$

On the other hand, following [6] the entropy and temperature on the event horizon are taken as

$$S_E = \frac{\pi {R_E}^2}{G} \quad , \quad T_A = \frac{H^2 R_E}{2\pi}. \tag{6}$$

Now due to inequality (4) we have

$$T_A < T_E \tag{7}$$

In reference [8], it has been shown that although GSLT is satisfied for any fluid distribution bounded by the apparent horizon but equilibrium criteria is not satisfied in the quintessence era even for perfect fluid with constant equation of state. However, for universe bounded by the event horizon both GSLT and equilibrium configuration are satisfied with some realistic conditions.

## THERMODYNAMICAL PRESCRIPTIONS FOR SOME DE MODELS

In the present work, we shall study the above thermodynamical prescriptions for universe bounded only by the event horizon for the following realistic DE fluid models:

i)Perfect fluid with constant equation of state: $p = \omega\rho$.

ii)Interacting holographic DE model.

iii)Modified Chaplygin Gas: a unified dark matter-DE model.

**Case I:** *Perfect fluid with constant equation of state:* $p = \omega\rho$, $\omega < -\frac{1}{3}$

Following reference [8] we have,

$$\dot{S}_E + \dot{S}_{fE} = \frac{2\pi R_E}{G} v_A v_E \tag{8}$$

$$\ddot{S}_E + \ddot{S}_{fE} = -\frac{2\pi}{G} v_A v_E [\frac{v_A}{v_E}(1 + v_E)^2 - (1 + 2v_E)] \tag{9}$$

where

$$v_A = \dot{R}_A = \frac{3}{2}(1 + \frac{p}{\rho}) \quad , \quad v_E = \dot{R}_E = HR_E - 1 \tag{10}$$

are the velocities of the apparent and the event horizon respectively.

In the quintessence era(i.e., $\rho + 3p < 0$ but $\rho + p > 0$) both $v_A$ and $v_E$(as $R_E > R_A$) are positive so GSLT is always satisfied, while for maximum entropy configuration we have $v_A > \frac{v_E(1+2v_E)}{(1+v_E)^2}$. On the other hand, in phantom domain $v_A < 0$ and we have the following criteria:

i) $v_E > 0$, GSLT is not satisfied but $\ddot{S}_E + \ddot{S}_{fE} < 0$ without any restriction.
ii)$v_E < 0$(i.e., $R_E < R_A$), GSLT is satisfied and there will be equilibrium configuration provided $|\frac{v_A}{v_E}| > \frac{(1+2v_E)}{(1+v_E)^2}$.

**Case II:** *Holographic Dark Energy(HDE) model:*

The dark fluid consists of interacting two components-one is the holographic dark energy with event horizon as the IR cut off while the other component(known as the dark matter(DM) component) is in the form of dust. The variable equation of state parameter for the DE has the form[4,13]

$$\omega_d = -\frac{1}{3} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c} - \frac{b^2}{\Omega_d} \tag{11}$$

where 'c' is a dimensionless parameter(estimated from the observation), the interaction term has the form $3b^2H(\rho_m + \rho_d)$ with '$b^2$' as the coupling parameter between DE and DM. The density parameter $\Omega_d$ evolves as[13]

$$\Omega_d^{'} = \Omega_d[(1 - \Omega_d)(1 + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\Omega_d}) - 3b^2] \tag{12}$$

where $' = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, $x = lna$.
The velocities of the horizons can be expressed in terms of the density parameter $\Omega_d$ as

$$v_A = \frac{3}{2}[(1 - b^2) - \frac{\Omega_d}{3}(1 + \frac{2\sqrt{\Omega_d}}{c})] \quad and \quad v_E = (\frac{c}{\sqrt{\Omega_d}} - 1) \tag{13}$$

Hence for thermodynamical analysis as before,

$$\dot{S}_E + \dot{S}_{fE} = \frac{2\pi R_E}{G} v_A v_E \tag{14}$$

and

$$\ddot{S}_E + \ddot{S}_{fE} = -\frac{2\pi}{G} v_A v_E \left[\frac{v_A}{v_E}(1+v_E)^2 - (1+2v_E) + \frac{3\Omega_d^{'}}{2v_A}\left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{2}{c}\sqrt{\Omega_d}\right)(1+v_E)\right] \tag{15}$$

Then for the fulfillment of the thermodynamical prescriptions we have the possibilities in the tabular form as follows:

**Table-I**: Thermodynamical conditions for $0 < b^2 < \frac{1}{3}$

| $v_A$ | $v_E$ | $\Omega_d$ | $\Omega_d^{'}$ | GSLT | Validity of thermodynamical equilibrium |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| + | + | $\Omega_d < min(\Omega_{d_0}, \Omega_{d_1}, c^2)$ | + | satisfied | satisfied, provided $\frac{v_A}{v_E} > \frac{1+2v_E}{(1+v_E)^2}$ |
| - | + | $\Omega_{d_0} < \Omega_d < min(\Omega_{d_1}, c^2)$ | + | not satisfied | satisfied without any restriction |
| - | - | $max(c^2, \Omega_{d_0}) < \Omega_d < \Omega_{d_1}$ | + | satisfied | no definite conclusion |
| - | - | $\Omega_d > max(c^2, \Omega_{d_0}, \Omega_{d_1})$ | - | satisfied | satisfied if $\lvert\frac{v_A}{v_E}\rvert > \frac{(1+2v_E)}{(1+v_E)^2}$ |

**Table-II**: Thermodynamical conditions for $\frac{1}{3} < b^2 < 1$

| $v_A$ | $v_E$ | $\Omega_d$ | $\Omega_d^{'}$ | GSLT | Equilibrium Prescri |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| + | + | $\Omega_\alpha < \Omega_d < min(\Omega_\beta, \Omega_{d_0}, c^2)$ | + | satisfied | satisfied, provided $\frac{v_A}{v_E} >$ |
| - | + | $max(\Omega_{d_0}, \Omega_\alpha) < \Omega_d < min(\Omega_\beta, c^2)$ | + | not satisfied | satisfied without any re |
| - | - | $max(c^2, \Omega_{d_0}, \Omega_{d_\alpha}) < \Omega_d < \Omega_\beta$ | + | satisfied | no definite conclus |
| - | - | either $\Omega_d > max(c^2, \Omega_{d_0}, \Omega_\beta)$ or $max(\Omega_{d_0}, c^2) < \Omega_d < \Omega_\alpha$ | - | satisfied | satisfied if $\lvert\frac{v_A}{v_E}\rvert > \frac{(1}{(1}$ |

In the above tables $\Omega_{d_0} = {x_0}^2$ where $x_0$ is the positive root of the cubic equation $2x^3 + cx^2 - 3c(1-b^2) = 0$. Similarly, for $0 < b^2 < \frac{1}{3}$, $\Omega_{d_1} = {x_1}^2$, where $x_1$ is the positive root of the cubic equation $2x^3 + cx^2 - 2x - c(1-b^2) = 0$, while for $\frac{1}{3} < b^2 < 1$, this cubic equation has two positive real roots $\alpha$ and $\beta$ ($\alpha < \beta$) and $\Omega_\alpha = \alpha^2$ and $\Omega_\beta = \beta^2$.

**Table-III**: Comparision of theoretical and observed values of $\Omega_d$

| $b^2$ | c | $\Omega_{d_0}$ | $\Omega_{d_1}$ | $\Omega_\alpha$ | $\Omega_\beta$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.10 | 0.60 | 0.842138 | 0.963734 | - | - |
| 0.20 | 0.75 | 0.855296 | 0.908099 | - | - |
| 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.861984 | 0.868036 | - | - |
| 0.40 | 0.70 | 0.755055 | - | 0.0722009 | 0.795915 |
| 0.55 | 0.80 | 0.700492 | - | 0.355441 | 0.557243 |

**Case III**: *Modified Chaplygin Gas:*

The equation of state for modified chaplygin gas(MCG) is given by[14]

$$p = \gamma\rho - \frac{B}{\rho^n} \tag{16}$$

where $\gamma \leq 1$, B> 0, $n > 0$ are the parameters of the model. If we choose $\gamma = \frac{1}{3}$ then this model describes the radiation era $p = \frac{1}{3}\rho$ at the very early stages of the evolution, then gradually with the evolution of the universe it enters into matter dominated era and then pressure becomes negative and finally it matches to the $\Lambda$CDM model $p = -\rho$ i.e., the MCG model is extended upto phantom barrier and phantom region is forbidden for this model. So if universe filled with MCG and bounded by event horizon is an isolated thermodynamical system, then the radius and velocity of the apparent horizon are given by:

$$R_A = R_0 \frac{a^{\frac{3}{2}}(1+\gamma)}{[Ba^{\mu}+C]^{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}} \quad , \quad v_A = \frac{3}{2}\frac{C(1+\gamma)}{(Ba^{\mu}+C)} \tag{17}$$

where $a$ is the scale factor of the FRW model, C is a constant of integration and $R_0 = \sqrt{\frac{3}{8\pi G}}(1+\gamma)^{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}$. On the other hand, the radius of the event horizon can be expressed in terms of Hypergeometric function function as

$$R_E = R_1 \; {}_2F_1[\frac{1}{2(n+1)}, \frac{1}{\mu}, 1+\frac{1}{\mu}, \frac{-C}{Ba^{\mu}}] \tag{18}$$

with $R_1 = \frac{R_0}{B^{\frac{1}{2(n+1)}}}$. Further, the sound speed($c_s$) is related to the velocity of the apparent horizon by the relation

$${c_s}^2 = \frac{\partial p}{\partial \rho} = \gamma_0 - \frac{2}{3} n v_A \tag{19}$$

where $\gamma_0 = \gamma + n(1+\gamma) > 0$. Thus for the total entropy variation we have the same expression as before, while for thermodynamic equilibrium we obtain

$$\ddot{S}_E + \ddot{S}_{fE} = -\frac{2\pi}{G} v_A v_E [HR_E\{(2+3\gamma_0) - (1+2n)v_A + \frac{v_A}{v_E}\} - v_E] \tag{20}$$

Hence for equilibrium configuration ($i.e., \ddot{S}_E + \ddot{S}_{fE} < 0$) we have an upper bound on $v_E$ namely $v_E < \frac{1}{1+2n}$. Also form equation (19), to have a realistic sound speed($0 < c_s^2 < 1$), $v_A$ and $\gamma$ are restricted as $v_A \in (\frac{3(\gamma_0 - 1)}{2n}, \frac{3\gamma_0}{2n})$ and $\gamma \in (\frac{-n}{n+1}, \frac{-n}{3(n+1)})$. Now as $n > 0$ so $\gamma$ should be $> -\frac{1}{3}$, i.e., MCG may be of DE nature.

## CONCLUSIONS

From the above thermodynamical analysis with DE in the form of perfect fluid with constant equation of state or for MCG model, the thermodynamical inequalities(given in equation (1)) restrict velocities at the horizons(event and apparent). However, for interacting HDE model there is restriction on the density parameter for DE and various possibilities are presented in tabular form, which shows that in few cases though GSLT is not satisfied but still equilibrium is attained. Also in table I and II, the restrictions on the density parameter involve the coupling parameters $b^2$ and c, and the bounds of $\Omega_d$ for various choices of $b^2$ and c are presented in table III. We see that the bounds are within the observational limit. Further, though MCG is a combined DM and DE model but interestingly for the present thermodynamical analysis, it may behave as a DE fluid. Thus universe bounded by the event horizon is a perfect thermodynamical system(second law of thermodynamics is valid for the system and equilibrium is attained) for the above DE models. Therefore, we may conclude that DE(which is predicted by recent observations) favours event horizon for universal thermodynamics.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

One of the authors(SC) is thankful to IUCAA, Pune, India for their warm hospitality as a part of the work has been done during a visit. Also SC is thankful to DRS programme in the Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University. The author SS is thankful to DST-PURSE Programme of Jadavpur University for awarding JRF.

# References

[1] A.G. Riess et al.*Astron. J.* **116**, 1009(1998); S. Perlmutter et al. *Astrophys. J.* **517** 565(1999).

[2] D.N. Spergel et al. *Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.* **148** 175(2003); **170** 377(2007).

[3] M. Tegmark et al. *Phys. Rev. D* **69** 103501(2004); D.J. Eisenstein et al. *Astrophys. J.* **633** 560(2005).

[4] B. Wang, Y. Gong and E. Abdalla, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** 083520(2006).

[5] N. Mazumdar and S. Chakraborty, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **26** 195016(2009); *Gen. Relt. Grav.* **42** 813(2010); *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70** 329(2010); S. Chakraborty, N. Mazumder and R. Biswas *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **91** 4007(2010); *Gen. Relt. Grav.* **43** 1827(2011); J. Dutta and S. Chakraborty *Gen. Relt. Grav.* **42** 1863(2010).

[6] S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Lett. B* **718** 276(2012).

[7] D. Pavon and W. Zimdahl, *Phys. Lett. B* **708** 217(2012).

[8] S. Saha and S. Chakraborty, *Phys. Lett. B* **717** 319(2012).

[9] N. Radicella and D. Pavon, *Gen. Rel. Grav* **44** 685(2012).

[10] H.B. Callen, *Thermodynamics* (J. Wiley, N.Y., 1960).

[11] G. Izquierdo and D. Pavon, *Phys. Lett. B* **633** 420(2006).

[12] C.L. Bennet etal., *Astron. and Astrophy.* **399** L19(2003); **399** L25(2003); P. de Bernardis etal., *Nature* **404** 955(2000); Gold etal., *APJs* **192** 15(2011).

[13] B. Wang, Y. Gong and E. Abdalla, *Phys. Rev. D* **624** 141(2005).

[14] U. Debnath, A. Banerjee, S. Chakraborty, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** 5609(2004)